

## REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed December 14, 2005. Applicant thanks Examiner Stone for the analysis contained in the Office Action. The foregoing amendments to Claims 1, 10, and 11 are believed to place the application in immediate condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and allowance of the application is requested.

Claim 1 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McIntock et al. Claims 2-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over McIntock in view of secondary references to Beigel et al., Steeves, Muhme, Hyatt, Jr., Werb et al., and Nykerk.

To assist in communicating the differences between the present invention and the McIntock et al reference, applicant submits herewith a Declaration by Robert Austen, Professional Engineer. Claim amendments have been made to Claims 1, 10, and 11 to emphasize the differences, as discussed by Mr. Austen. These differences relate to the use of the detection loop to create a perimeter boundary. In particular, Claim 1 recites "providing each security door with a detection loop *defining a perimeter boundary that separates an area of permissible movement from an area of restricted access* near the security door." (Emphasis added). Claims 10 and 11 recite "providing a detection loop defining a perimeter boundary that separates of an area of permissible movement from an area of restricted access." The differences between the present invention and the teachings of the McIntock reference become increasingly apparent as the length of the perimeter boundary is increased. McIntock focuses upon single point access, not security along a perimeter. The deficiencies in the teachings of McIntock are not overcome by the teachings of Beigel, Steeves, Muhme, Hyatt, Werb, and Nykerk.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

In view of the foregoing amendments, applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



Kevan L. Morgan


Registration No. 42,015

Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

2.14.2006



KLM:sdd

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100